

## **REMARKS**

The Japanese reference AQ was inadvertently included in the Information Disclosure Statement listing and is not relevant.

The Examiner rejected previous claims 13-16, 20-26 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as anticipated by Parry. Claims 17-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Parry in view of Chiba.

New claim 27 clearly distinguishes over the primary reference Parry for the following reasons. Claim 27 recites detecting with a plurality of monitoring units a plurality of temporally successive error states of the printer or copier created by a causative error. This language was in previous dependent claim 14 and is discussed in Applicants' Substitute Specification at page 2, line 3; and page 8, lines 14-20 and lines 25-27 discussing causative error. In Parry, this feature is not present. Rather in Parry, different parts of the printer send an error identification to the error message generator E4. However, each one of these errors is individual and does not represent a plurality of temporally successive error states created by a single causative error.

Next, claim 27 distinguishes by reciting evaluating the stored plurality of temporally successive error states and comparing the stored plurality of temporally successive error states with predetermined error state patterns and determining at least one error type identifying said causative error. See the noted parts of Applicants' Substitute Specification. Nothing like this occurs in Parry. Rather in Parry individual errors are simply sent to an error message generator E4 which then searches the data base for an appropriate error message related to the individual detected error and outputs that error message. There is no comparison with a predetermined error state pattern. The error state pattern of claim 27 is a

predetermined pattern of error states as explained in Applicants' specification above. Nothing like this occurs in Parry. Parry only associates an error message to a detected error. There is no error state pattern.

The secondary reference Chiba was only cited for implementing an automatic error correction. However, Chiba does not satisfy all of the above noted deficiencies of Parry.

Dependent claims 28-37 distinguish at least for the reasons claim 27 distinguishes and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Independent claim 38 distinguishes at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 27.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to account No. 501519.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Brett A. Valiquet (Reg.No.27,841)  
Brett A. Valiquet  
Schiff Hardin LLP  
Patent Department  
6600 Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 258-5786  
Attorneys for Applicants.  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**